

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Patent Application

Applicant(s): B. M. Jakobsson et al.

Docket No.: 47-2

Serial No.: 10/060,599

Filing Date: January 30, 2002

Group: 2137

Examiner: Courtney D. Fields

Title: Method and Apparatus for Identification Tagging
Documents in a Computer System

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The following remarks are submitted in response to the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance included in the Notice of Allowability dated November 28, 2007 in the above-identified application.

REMARKS

Applicants have reviewed the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance (hereinafter "Statement") given on pages 2-5 of the November 28, 2007 Notice of Allowability. Based on this review, it appears that certain aspects of the Statement may be viewed as mischaracterizing the scope of the allowed claims.

For example, on page 2, last paragraph, the Examiner states that each independent claim identifies uniquely distinct features quoted by the Examiner. Although the quoted text is present in independent claims 1 and 14, the quoted text is not present in independent claim 8.

Moreover, on pages 3-4, the Examiner identifies each of three independent references as being "the closest prior art." It is logically impossible for a plurality of independent references to each be "the closest prior art."

Furthermore, in describing each of these references, the Examiner states that the reference fails to "anticipate or render the claimed limitation of creating an identification tag by performing a cryptographic function wherein the function of the document is a hash function."

Applicants respectfully note that the independent claims do not include the limitation recited by the Examiner. Rather, independent claims 1, 8 and 14 recite limitations wherein an identification tag is created or calculated by performing a cryptographic function on a function of the document and a unique processor identifier. Dependent claims 2, 9 and 15 recite limitations wherein the function of the document is a hash function.

In summary, Applicants believe that each of claims 1-20 is allowable because the particular limitations thereof are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. To the extent that the Statement includes language which does not accurately reflect the claim limitations or attempts to characterize the prior art in a manner inconsistent with prior responses filed by Applications, the Statement is respectfully traversed.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: November 30, 2007

Joseph B. Ryan
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 37,922
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560
(516) 759-7517